

HX21
F82S

AA0004295507



CHALISM EXPLAINED





THE LIBRARY
OF
THE UNIVERSITY
OF CALIFORNIA
LOS ANGELES





SOCIALISM EXPLAINED

By
F. D. FOWLER

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2008 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

Price **1/-** net

LONDON
GRANT RICHARDS LIMITED

<http://www.archive.org/details/socialismexplain00fowl>

SOCIALISM EXPLAINED

THE SOCIETY FOR UPHOLDING POLITICAL HONOUR



Address—25 FITZ-JAMES AVENUE, W. 14.

Telephone—WESTERN 4712.

Chairman—Sir H. O. BAX-IRONSIDE, K.C.M.G.

Hon. Sec. and Treasurer—F. D. FOWLER.

Bankers—LONDON COUNTY, WESTMINSTER & PARR'S BANK,
VICTORIA STREET, WESTMINSTER, S.W. 1.



"Then none was for a Party, then all were for the State."



AIMS AND OBJECTS.

1. To expose the abuses of Government by Party.
2. To restore to the electorate and to Members of Parliament the independence they have lost owing to the growth of Party organization.
3. To combat the increasing dependence of Political Parties on money, more especially when given and spent secretly.
4. To secure that Honours and Dignities shall be bestowed only as a reward for services rendered to the State, and in no case for monetary considerations.
5. To support as Parliamentary Candidates, men of character pledged to subordinate Party to National interests.
6. To encourage in the Press a spirit of independence of Party.
7. To co-operate with other organizations whose aims are wholly or partly identical with those of this Society.
8. Generally to direct attention to all lapses from Political or National Honour.



CONDITIONS OF MEMBERSHIP.

Members must be British-born of British parents. (The Committee, however, reserve to themselves the right to accept or reject candidates whether they fulfil this condition or not.)



TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION.

	£	s.	d.
Life Members (one donation)	5	0	0
Vice-Presidents (Annual Subscription)	1	0	0
Members	0	5	0
Associates	0	1	0

Donations of any amount will be welcome.

SOCIALISM EXPLAINED

BY

F. D. FOWLER

Hon. Secretary of the Society for Upholding Political Honour



LONDON

GRANT RICHARDS, LTD.

ST. MARTIN'S STREET

1920

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
LIBRARY
540 EAST 57TH STREET
CHICAGO, ILL. 60637

LIBRARY
F82.5

PREFACE

MANY learned books which the ordinary reader has seldom time to digest have been written on the subject of Socialism, and an enormous mass of pamphlets and articles of a violently partisan character have been published. In the following pages an attempt has been made to give a brief history of the movement and a sketch of its leading characters, and to present as concisely as may be the arguments for and against the doctrine.

12 MAR 1922

INTRODUCTION

MUCH confusion of thought has arisen from the loose way in which the words Socialism and Democracy are commonly used. Those extremists who seek for what they call "the dictatorship of the proletariat," believe that Democracy means mob rule, while in the minds of most it denotes a system under which such people as are deemed capable of exercising the franchise delegate their powers of government to their chosen representatives. The root meaning of Socialism on the other hand is a beneficent one and is not inconsistent with democracy as the term is usually understood. However this may be there is no question that the cause has suffered in popular estimation in this country owing to the attitude of its exponents who, with a few honourable exceptions, such as Hyndman and Blatchford, have, to put it as mildly as possible, done little to help their country in the late war.

.

It is just as difficult for the "comfortable" classes to appreciate the point of view of the proletariat of which Socialists pose as the champions as it is for the latter to be satisfied with "things as they are."

But a doctrine which has found acceptance among millions in other countries, and which is rapidly gaining ground in our own, deserves more respectful consideration at the hands of the propertied class than it usually receives.

SOCIALISM EXPLAINED

DEFINITIONS

SOCIALISM

It is difficult to formulate a precise and satisfactory definition of a philosophy which assumes such protean shapes. Speaking generally, Socialism professes to be a solution of what Stephen Leacock aptly calls "the unsolved riddle of Social Justice." It is perhaps safe to say that all Socialists, whether Evolutionary or Revolutionary, as well as all Syndicalists and Anarchists, have the same end in view. This is to substitute collective for private ownership of land and capital, though even here one is confronted with the difficulty that such leading exponents as Mr. Philip Snowden and Mr. Ramsay Macdonald assure us, that in the Socialistic State there will still be room for some measure of private enterprise and ownership; while others again, who call themselves Socialists, merely seek to enlarge the principle of co-operation in industries at the expense of that of competition.

Where all these thinkers differ is as to the means by which the object is to be gained. The Evolutionists look for a gradual, and the Revolutionists for a sudden, change: Syndicalists propose either to drive out the Capitalist by a succession of strikes, so as to render the industry unprofitable, or else by a general strike to paralyse all industries; while Anarchists would reduce all Society to chaos in the hope that some better system would arise from the ruins.

One of the earlier Socialists, Roscher German, defines

Socialism as "those tendencies which demand a greater regard for the common weal than is consistent with human nature," a definition which expresses very concisely the view of the anti-Socialist! Less ingenious exponents say that its central aim is "to terminate the divorce of the workers from the means of subsistence and culture, which can only be accomplished by placing the ownership and control of the means of production, transport, and exchange in the hands of the State."

CAPITALISM

Most Socialists recognise that Capital, which is the accumulation of surplus wealth, is essential to the well-being of the community. But they object to the system under which capital and land, from which all surplus wealth is ultimately derived, are owned by individuals. This system they call Capitalism.

Before attempting an investigation of latter-day Socialism it is essential to glance at its earlier history and to study the ideas and character of the early thinkers, since these shed much light on its modern development.

HISTORY

FRANCE

SOCIALISM, then, first appears in France, always the birthplace of new ideas, in the person of ST. SIMON, who came of the younger branch of the dukes of that name and was born in 1760.

His principal book, *Le Nouveau Christianism*, propounds an arrangement by which the industrial chiefs shall control Society, while its spiritual direction shall be in the hands of men of science. The new Christianity is to clear away the dogmas which surround both the Protestant and Catholic forms of it. To prevent the exploitation of man by man the law of

inheritance is to be abolished, men and women are to be placed on a footing of absolute equality, and a social hierarchy is to be established in which everyone shall be placed according to his capacity and rewarded according to his merits.

The followers of his school, Bazard, Leroux, Enfantin and others, who lived out of a common purse in Paris, developed his ideas into a system of free-love with a religious sanction. It is not perhaps surprising that when these philosophers put their tenets into practice the school should have sunk amidst the indignation and laughter of a scandalised society.

FOURIER, who was born in 1772, the son of a prosperous draper, was a model of simplicity, kindness, and devotion to what he thought to be the highest aims. At the age of five his father punished him for telling the truth about some goods in his shop, which injustice seems to have rankled in his boyish mind; at twenty-seven he had to superintend the destruction of immense quantities of rice which had been held for a rise till it had gone bad. These incidents convinced him of the immorality of the present system and led him to propound his celebrated system of "phalanges." The idea was to form communities of four hundred families on a square league of land, which were to be employed in industrial as well as agricultural work, so as to be self-supporting. Twenty-four of these groups were to form a "phalange" and the phalanges would unite to form a federation under one administrative chief with Constantinople as capital. / Freedom of the individual was to be preserved against possible tyranny of the phalange by the existence under social control of individual Capital: a highly original feature of the scheme was that hard and common labour was to be the most highly paid, useful work next, and pleasant work last. / How pleased would the shade of Fourier be to find in our day the labour of the scavenger assessed at a higher value than

that of the school teacher, and the miner better paid than the average bank clerk, doctor, or parson! Fourier had the courage of his opinions and started a phalange in 1832, which was a failure; but the general idea was revived by Robert Owen and has indeed some features in common with Sir Eric Geddes' scheme for moving industrial factories from the towns into the country.

PROUDHON, born in 1809, the son of a banker, was the coiner of the celebrated phrase "*La Propriété c'est le vol*," which occurs in his *Philosophy of Misery*, published in 1846. The principle is here enunciated that the duration of labour is the just measure of its value, and that all labour should be remunerated on a basis of perfect equality. Severely simple, upright, and even puritanic, he repudiated the prurient ideas of the St. Simon and Fourier school, but none the less attacked the clergy and other institutions, for which he was imprisoned for three years: he then escaped and fled to Brussels, where he died in 1865.

LOUIS BLANC, who was the son of an inspector-general of finance, was born in Madrid in 1811. His theory (a very admirable one if human nature were otherwise than it is) was that genius or service should be remunerated by the consciousness of the benefit conferred by it on Society and not by monetary rewards. (The same idea is reproduced by Philip Snowden and Ramsay Macdonald.) The aspiration of the workman to control the means of production was to be satisfied by means of social workshops. These were to be provided by the State, which would draw up rules, and administer them till they became self-supporting, and thus remove the evils of unrestricted competition. The experiment of National or State workshops was actually tried in Paris at a time of widespread unemployment and was a disastrous failure, resulting in the Revolution of 1848, but it is fair to say that according to Kirkup, a very fair-minded Social-

istic writer, the workshops were not established on the lines advocated by Louis Blanc, and were said, indeed, to have been instituted in order to discredit him.

Till 1830 Socialism in France appealed to the educated classes only, but about that time the bourgeoisie and the proletariat which had hitherto made common cause against Feudalism became opposed to each other, and Paris now became the seat of Socialism in its more modern sense of a war of the proletariat against capitalism.

ENGLAND

Turning now to England, the earliest and by far the greatest Socialist was ROBERT OWEN, who was born in 1771, the son of a saddler and ironmonger, and who found himself at the age of nineteen manager of a cotton mill, with five hundred operatives, which he made the best in England. He then became manager and partner of the New Lanark Mills, with 2500 hands, and eventually formed a new firm, with Jeremy Bentham and William Allen, the well-known Quaker, as partners, which was content with 5 per cent return on capital. Under his management New Lanark, formerly a centre of drunkenness, vice, and ignorance, was so transformed by restriction of drink, the institution of co-operative stores, infant schools, and other reforms that it became a place of pilgrimage for the Social reformer. His first departure in Socialism was a report to the committee on the Poor Law, which was well received by *The Times* and the Duke of Kent. His scheme was somewhat similar to Fourier's, namely, to form settlements equipped with the best machinery, which would correct the monotony of factory work by providing the alternation of agricultural employment : as population increased the settlements were to be united in tens, hundreds, and thousands till they filled the whole world. He spent his money in promoting communistic experiments on these lines in New Harmony in America, Glasgow, and Ireland, all

of which were failures, though he succeeded in reducing the hours of labour in factories, in founding infant schools, and in starting the co-operative movement. His personal character was without reproach, but unfortunately for him he lost his influence by his attacks on religion.

DAVID RICARDO was a Dutch Jew born in 1772, and a successful member of the Stock Exchange. He studied political economy as expounded by Adam Smith, and published a book in which he advocated a tax on property to pay off the National Debt. The tax on capital, which has attracted Mr. Bonar Law and Mr. Austen Chamberlain, is no new idea. His theory was that the value of an article produced under free competition is determined by its cost in labour and that the wages of labour tend to equal the cost of the workman's bare subsistence. Though his sympathies were really with the Capitalist, he is quoted by Socialistic writers in support of their own contentions.

THE CHRISTIAN SOCIALISTS

In a sketch of early English Socialism the Christian Socialists—Ruskin, Maurice, Hughes, Ludlow, and Kingsley—should not escape notice. The Christian Socialist movement was a protest against the gross materialism of the Manchester School, and its followers contended that Socialism properly understood was Christianity.

Socialism in England waned for the time in 1852, as a consequence, apparently, of industrial prosperity, and from that date German and Russian Socialists have been most prominent.

GERMANY

Of German Socialists the first to make his mark was LASSALLE, the originator of the Social Democratic Movement, who was born in Breslau, the son of a prosperous Jewish merchant, in 1825. He studied

philosophy with Hegel and Heine (another Jew) in Paris and attached himself to Marx, Engels, the poet Freiligarth, and others who represented the extreme revolutionary side of Socialism. He propounded the celebrated theory of the "iron law of wages," which asserted that under Capitalism the workman's standard of life cannot rise beyond subsistence level because increased prosperity results in increase of births, which brings down wages by increased competition : nor can wages fall below that level, since a diminished population due to fewer births would increase the demand for workers. The remedy, he argued, must be the establishment by the State of self-governing productive associations in which every worker would get the full reward of his labour. He founded the "Universal Working Men's Association " in 1863, amid scenes of extraordinary enthusiasm. He was of fashionable and luxurious habits, vain and with little common sense or self-respect, and was killed in a duel with Count Racowitz over a woman he wanted to marry.

RODBERTUS, who is regarded by some as the founder of "Scientific " Socialism, was the son of a University Professor and was born in 1805. Unlike most Socialists, he was a monarchist and a patriot. The basis of his teaching was that of Ricardo and Adam Smith. Labour being the source and measure of value, rent profit and wages are all part of the national income produced by the united labour of the community. But the possession by the Landowner and the Capitalist of the means of production enables them to force the workman to divide the product of his labour with them in such a proportion that the latter has only a subsistence allowance. Hence Society must be organised on a communistic basis, and as an immediate step towards that goal the State must fix the working day, the normal day's work, and the legal wage, the better workmen receiving the higher wages. It is interesting to notice how far we have travelled of late along this road.

But the greatest of the German Socialists was, of course, KARL MARX, the son of a Jewish lawyer born in Treves in 1818. Though baptised with the rest of the family as a Christian Protestant we have it on the authority of his son-in-law, Dr. Aveling, that Marx was, like himself, a convinced atheist. He studied law and philosophy in Bonn and Berlin, and then went to Paris, where he associated with Heine, Proudhon, Engels, and other Socialists till he was expelled in 1845 and settled in London till his death in 1883. Kirkup says that "in learning, philosophic acumen and literary power he was second to no economic thinker of the nineteenth century. Sincere, courageous, and indefatigable in the cause of the proletariat, he spent forty years in exile for what he thought to be the truth." Professor Hearnshaw in *Democracy at the Crossways*, paints a less flattering portrait. "His inspiring passion was hate, hatred of religion, of the bourgeoisie, even of his fellow-haters, Proudhon, Lassalle, and Bakunin." But it is still not surprising that such a man should have exercised enormous influence. His teaching is based on the theory of "surplus values," which originated with Ricardo, Rodbertus, and Proudhon. His most important literary work is *Das Kapital*, which deals with the economic side of history, hitherto neglected by philosophic historians. In this he contends that the history of Capitalism is the history of the appropriation of surplus values. The decay of feudalism and the distribution of the Church lands among private individuals substituted absolute ownership for the feudal custom under which land was held in trust from the Crown for services rendered. This resulted in the management of land for private profit, which drove the peasantry from the land into the towns or into vagrancy: hence a landless proletariat and pauperism. These evils were later accentuated by the introduction of machinery on a large scale simultaneously with a

sudden access of wealth due to the slave trade and the exploitation of India and America. Production then became concentrated in the hands of Capitalists, who drilled the workers into industrial armies, each Capitalist competing with the other for markets. These get overstocked by the increasing productive power of machinery until a commercial crisis arises and unemployment, starvation, and misery ensue. This state of things will continue until the proletariat seizes political power, expropriates the Capitalist, and appropriates the means of production, which it will then manage in its own interest, which is the interest of the community, and the State as we know it will disappear.

Hilaire Belloc, who is by no means a Socialist, gives a somewhat similar account of the history of Capitalism in his book *The Servile State*, in which he argues that Capitalism is an unstable condition of Society and must sooner or later be replaced by a servile state unless a largely preponderating number of the population become possessed of private property.

Until Marx's time Socialism was mainly a subject for theorists and experimentalists, but Marx and Engels perceived that a surer road to success lay in political organisation, and in 1863 the "Universal Working Men's Association," founded by Lassalle, Liebknecht, and August Bebel, became the "Social Democratic Party." It is interesting to read their programme announced at Erfurt in 1891 as showing the great strides that Socialism, or rather perhaps Social reform, has made since that date.

1. Universal equal and direct suffrage.
2. Self-government in Empire, State, and Commune.
3. A people's army and arbitration for national disputes.
4. Right of combination of workers.

5. Equality of the sexes.
6. No public funds for religious purposes.
7. Compulsory, free, secular, education.
8. Free administration of justice and free legal advice.
9. Free medical treatment.
10. Graduated taxation and no indirect tax.
11. Eight-hour day.
12. No child labour for profit under fourteen.
13. Abolition of truck system.
14. Labour department for supervision of factories and regulation of hours of labour.
15. State regulated insurance with co-operation of the workers.

RUSSIA

In Russia Socialism has always been of the Anarchist type. The chief apostle was BAKUNIN, who was born in 1814, a scion of the highest Russian aristocracy. He resigned his commission in the Army on witnessing the horrors of despotic rule in Poland. After eight years' imprisonment in fortresses and exile in Siberia he escaped to London in 1860 and founded the Social Democratic Alliance, merged in 1864 into the "Internationale," from which he was expelled by Marx at the Hague Congress. His doctrine rejected all ideas of God or external authority and taught that the liberty of man consisted in obeying the Laws of Nature. Consequently he sought to abolish all religion, marriage, class, inheritance of property, and patriotism. The land, capital, and instruments of labour were to be common property.

PRINCE KROPOTKIN, who also came of the highest aristocracy, a man of science, of kindly nature and courteous manners, was moved to espouse the cause of the workers by the cruelties endured by the serfs on his father's estate. He saw no prospect of reform except by revolution against the despotic Russian

Government, and after imprisonment for his opinions sought refuge in Switzerland.

TOLSTOI, born in 1828, was greatly influenced by Rousseau, whose plea for nature, honest work, and simplicity of life impressed him greatly. The emancipation of the serfs, whom he affirmed to be stronger, more just, human, and necessary, than the ruling class, was his great aim. The misery of the poor induced him to surrender all his lands and property and to live the life of a peasant. He was an anarchist in the sense that he believed that every man should be a law to himself, and obey the dictates of his nature. Though not himself a revolutionary or nihilist, his books seem to have fostered these tendencies in others.

Socialism in Russia has always been so extreme that it is hardly necessary to trace its further history through Nihilism towards the anarchy which now prevails in that unhappy country.

THE "INTERNATIONALE"

Socialism has always aspired to enlist the co-operation of the workers in every country irrespective of nation, creed or colour, and its efforts have nearly always proceeded from exiles banished by despotic governments.

In 1836 German exiles in Paris formed a secret society, called "The League of the Just," which removed to London in 1839, where it was recognized in 1847 as "the Communistic League." It aimed at the overthrow of the bourgeoisie and the foundation of a new type of Society without classes or private property. Marx and Engels set forth its principles in a manifesto shortly before the Revolution of 1848, emphasizing "the iron law of wages" and the theory of "surplus values," and calling for the abolition of private property, the family, and patriotism, since "the work-

man has no country." Its battle cry was "Workers of all lands unite." After the Revolution of 1848 a period of unexampled prosperity set in which was inimical to Socialism, and the first "Internationale" died out in 1852.

Ten years later, on the occasion of the great International Exhibition in London, France sent over a deputation to confer with English Socialists, and a great meeting was held in St. Martin's Hall, at which Marx drew up the inaugural address and statutes, and a general council was appointed to sit in London and summon annual conferences composed of delegates from different countries. The first congress was held in Geneva in 1866; others followed at Lausanne, Brussels, and Basle, at which resolutions were passed prohibiting the appropriation by Capital of the product of industries, and affirming that Labour should have the whole reward of its exertions. A split occurred at the Hague Congress in 1872 when Karl Marx expelled Bakunin and other extreme anarchists, and removed the seat of the General Council to New York. One more congress was held at Geneva, in 1873, and the "Internationale" then expired, to be revived in 1889, and again as we know it in our own day.

TRADE-UNIONISM

The connection between Socialism and Trade-Unionism is now so intimate that it is impossible to discuss the one movement without the other. This connection is a purely modern development, and whereas Socialism, as we have seen, is of alien origin Trade-Unionism is essentially English. The two ideas are mutually destructive, for Trade-Unionism may be described as the rebellious child of Capitalism, and in the Socialistic State parent and child would perish together, a fact which the Trade-Unions are unfortunately slow to recognise.

The Trade-Union movement was in its inception a fight for freedom from the economic slavery imposed on the English worker by the newly-rich masters of industry of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. At its best it stood for a high standard of workmanship, mutual help, and brotherhood, and the "fair deal" with the employer, and greatly improved the condition of the workers. Then came the long struggle for "recognition." The masters' standpoint was that while they would negotiate with representatives of their own employees, whether union or non-union, they would treat with no one not in their employment, since a surrender to this demand would abrogate their power to conduct their business as they thought best. The Trade-Union won, and the old conceptions of master and man disappeared to be replaced by a dehumanised relation between workmen and employers, which engenders a perpetual state of warfare. In the early days the struggle was purely economic, but of late years, and especially since the Trades-Disputes Act of 1906 (described by Professor Hearnshaw in *Democracy at the Crossways* as the "Magna Charta of Syndicalism"), the control of the Trade-Unions has largely passed into the hands of the Syndicalists, who use the weapon of the strike for political ends and now largely control foreign and domestic policy. These later developments of the movement have been attended by a steady debasement of ideals. One can hardly now correctly describe Trade-Unions as "the aristocracy of labour," seeing that they comprise labour of every description, skilled and unskilled; nor would the "aristocrat" tolerate the calculated dishonesty of "ca' canny," the repudiation of agreements, the lack of discipline which permits the "unauthorised" strike, the callous selfishness of a policy which denies to the discharged and disabled soldier an opportunity to gain an honest living, or the complex net of red-tape in which the Trade-Unions

have bound the wheels of industry. Nor would any true democrat tolerate such a travesty of the principle of representation as the card vote.

We have been told by no less an authority than the Prime Minister that lawyers and doctors are as much Trade-Unionists as are members of the National Union of Railwaymen or the Dockers' Union : there is, however, a wide difference : for no one need be a lawyer or a doctor unless he likes, but in many industries the manual worker is practically *forced* to belong to a Trade-Union of one kind or another (sometimes, as in the case of dock labourers, to several) or starve. The freedom of the individual to dispose of his labour and his money as he thinks best has almost disappeared, and the Trade-Union has in its turn become as tyrannical as the old-time employer against whom it revolted. When a Minister of the Crown has to plead with Trade-Union leaders to allow workmen who are not members of a close corporation to assist in building houses for themselves, and other workers, the extent to which individual freedom has been sacrificed on the altar of class privilege will be clearly realised.

The surrender of individual freedom will be complete when every worker is compelled by law to join a Union and every employer to belong to a Federation. This is looked on by some thinkers as the only means to secure industrial harmony and the equitable division of the profits arising from the joint exertions of employer and employee : it has at least this merit that compulsion by the State is less intolerable than compulsion of one group of citizens by another group.

Nowhere perhaps is the influence of Socialism on Trade-Unionism more marked—and more to be deplored—than in its attitude towards the alien who swarms in our big cities to the manifest detriment of the British workers. Earl Stanhope, when introducing his Naturalization Bill, estimated the resident alien population at 270,000 and its cost to the taxpayer in

housing subsidies at 13½ millions. He might have added an equal sum for education, etc. This alien population was being recruited in the early months of 1920 at the rate of twelve hundred a month. Yet when it is proposed to restrict their immigration the champions of the English Trade-Unionist are up in arms. They even misrepresent him as being in sympathy with Lenin, Trotsky, and his Jewish commissaries who have succeeded after unheard-of barbarities in imposing on the helpless Russians a regime of industrial slavery.

A reform of Trade-Unionism is one of the most necessary—and difficult—tasks to which its well-wishers can direct their energies, and here a correct appreciation of the limitations within which the use of the strike weapon should be confined is particularly necessary. In a free country every man must be at liberty to withdraw his labour if the conditions of the employment are not to his liking (so long as he is not thereby breaking an agreement into which he has entered with his employer), and this must be as true of a number of men acting in association as of an individual. But the workmen cannot legitimately claim at the same time a lien on their appointment and forcibly prevent others from undertaking the work which they have abandoned, for this is manifestly an injustice to other willing workmen as well as to the employer. This is the contention of the "National Free Labour Association" (5 Farringdon Avenue), which pleads for the "right to work" for its many thousand members who regard the "freedom to labour" as sacred as Trade-Unionists do the "right to strike."

Neither is it consonant with equity to allow an association of individuals to do acts which if performed by a single one, would expose him to an action at law. Still less is it legitimate to use an economic weapon to secure political ends, as, for instance, the refusal of dockers to handle munitions consigned to Poland, or of

railwaymen to work trains conveying troops in Ireland. Every institution requires from time to time to be overhauled and modified to suit new circumstances "lest one good custom should corrupt the world," and Trade-Unionism is no exception to the rule.

CONCLUSIONS FROM PAST HISTORY

The conclusions to be drawn from this survey seem to be :—

1. Socialism did not originate with the workers : its advocates, almost without exception, have been men of the upper and middle classes, many of them of the highest character, who, impressed by the sufferings and wrongs of the working class and the concentration of wealth in a few hands, have sought a remedy in Socialism.

2. With the exception of the English Christian Socialists, nearly all Socialists are opposed to Christianity, and most to religion in any form. This is equally true of the great majority of the moderns, and notably of the Jewish Russian Soviet. The reason seems to be that Socialism is a purely materialistic philosophy and necessarily antagonistic to non-material conceptions. Yet we have the curious anomaly that Socialists postulate in their ideal state a community so altruistic that the individual will find adequate reward for his exertions in the estimation in which he is held by his fellows. It is safe to say that such an ideal community could not exist unless inspired by religious convictions which Socialists reject.

3. Socialism in England is of alien (and largely German) origin, for Robert Owen was essentially an autocrat, while he and Ruskin, Maurice and Kingsley were rather social reformers than Socialists.

4. Socialism is not an uncharted sea : its shores are strewn with the wrecks of many a tall ship. A full description of the experiments that have been made to establish communities on a Socialistic or Communistic

basis is given in Mallock's *Limitations of Pure Democracy*, from which it will be seen that the only successes recorded are those which were founded on religious motives. *Where Socialism Failed* gives a similar account.

5. Practically all Socialists are internationalists: the theory being that since the interests of the working class are necessarily opposed to Capitalism there should be a common bond between the workers of all countries. This is expressed, as we have seen, in the Marxian manifesto, "Workers of all lands unite." A hatred of patriotism colours in consequence all socialistic thought. Patriotism when it takes the form of Jingoism may be rightly condemned, but the sentiment "my country right or wrong" is at least a higher one than "my country always in the wrong."

6. The anti-patriotic and internationalist bias of Socialism has been largely due to the teaching of philosophers of Jewish race, who have in most cases repudiated all religion. It is therefore not surprising to find that the leaders of the Russian Soviet are practically all Jews, or that the notorious Bela Kun is of the same Asiatic race. Of a total of 556 high-grade officials of Soviet Russia 458 are Jews. Thirty-five of the remainder are Letts, of whom about 90 per cent are camouflaged Jews. The tendency of modern finance is increasingly international and modern finance is largely controlled by Jewish firms or individuals. It may be that the Jews whose national instinct is as strongly developed as that of other races but who are not, and see no prospect of being, a nation in the ordinary acceptance of the term—conceive that their interest lies in the destruction of nationalism and the substitution of a world-commonwealth in which they would be on the same plane as other races. They would then, by their industry and talent for organization and money-making, be in a position to dominate the world. That extraordinary book, *The Jewish Peril*,

originally published by Messrs. Eyre and Spottiswoode, and now by "The Britons" (62 Oxford Street, 3s. net.), purports to show that this is in fact the deliberate aim of the leaders of a secret society of Jewish free-masons, an aim of which the general body of English Jews are doubtless entirely unaware. In this connection Mrs. Webster's monograph on the French Revolution adduces evidence to show that the French, like the Russian, Terror was engineered by a secret society and carried out mainly by Aliens, and not as generally supposed by the French people.

MODERN SOCIALISTS AND THEIR IDEAS

Among modern thinkers Philip Snowden and Ramsay Macdonald have presented the case for Socialism as well perhaps as any. They contend that the present system is unjust to the manual workers, inasmuch as these do not obtain a fair share of the fruits of their labours, and cannot do so as long as land and capital are privately owned.

They assert, and give figures in support of their contention, that in spite of the enormous increase in production of commodities due to labour-saving machinery the daily toil of the manual workers has not diminished, nor has their condition improved. They claim that taking into account the total wealth of the nation and the increase in population, the worker receives a smaller proportionate share of the wealth he creates than he did before the industrial era, while before the war the proportion of workers unemployed over an average of years was never less than 5 per cent.

The workman having no control over the means of production is, they say, practically a wage-slave, and the soul-destroying repetition work which is a feature of mass-production reduces numbers to the level of human machines.

The deplorable fact that thousands are underfed and housed in slums, that drunkenness and immorality

are rife, is, they contend, the necessary result of unrestricted competition. They admit that competition is a human instinct, that it has been useful in the past and can be used for good or bad ends ; but they assert that as regards the production and distribution of wealth it is wrongly applied and brings about misery and ruin. As a proof of its wastefulness they point to the immense sums expended in advertisement, in the salaries of commercial travellers, the unnecessary number of retail shops selling the same article at practically the same price, the loss involved in the bankruptcy of unsuccessful enterprises, and so on.

Unrestricted competition develops, they say, the animal and not the human instincts, and makes men hard, cruel, selfish and acquisitive, and while admitting that competition has stimulated invention, they claim that co-operation would quite probably have given still better results in this direction.

They recognise that the unrestricted competition of privately owned concerns and limited liability companies is passing away, and that the tendency to-day is to eliminate competition in different industries and services by the creation of Rings, Trusts, and Combines. This tendency may be seen in banking, shipping, multiple shops, iron and steel and textile industries, and a number of services such as omnibuses, railways, and tramways. These Trusts and Combines cheapen production by increasing the unit of Capital, reducing establishment charges, standardising design, eliminating competition as regards selling prices, and preventing "gluts" and "slumps," and are so far beneficial. On the other hand they place both producer and consumer at a disadvantage, since the control of production lies in the hands of groups of financiers who can regulate output and prices and who, having no other motive than money-making, can coerce the workers by closing down one or more concerns and concentrating on others. The advantages of the Trust can only be retained and

its drawbacks avoided, so Mr. Snowden argues, by socialising them: this, he says, is the natural law of industrial evolution—competition—Trusts—Socialism.

Further arguments for Socialism are that since the work of production is co-operative the ownership of the means should also be co-operative.

That the Capitalistic system enables a rich class to withdraw from production large numbers of workers and to employ them in making luxuries or in parasitic service.

That a great number of industries and services are now owned and efficiently administered by the State or by municipal bodies—such as light railways, tramways, gas, water, and electrical undertakings, docks, ferries, museums, libraries, allotments, post office, telegraphs, telephones, and many others, and that the principle may therefore be indefinitely extended.

That there is no financial difficulty or injustice in transferring them to the State, which has only to issue Government bonds to the shareholders in exchange for their shares, as was done in the case of the London Docks and Metropolitan Water Companies, and that there has been no protest from the community against these Socialistic measures which could therefore be extended with advantage to all other undertakings.

That the progress already made in the direction of Socialism by such measures as Old Age Pensions, National Health, and Unemployment Insurance Acts, the Minimum Wage and Hours Acts, the Death Duties, free and compulsory education, differential income tax assessment and so forth, shows the growing acceptance of Socialistic theories and the means by which they may be extended and the glaring inequalities of wealth removed.

Mr. Snowden and Mr. Ramsay Macdonald do not apparently contemplate the complete abolition of private property or enterprise, nor do they seek for

equality but only for "equality of opportunity." The State, they say, will settle the rate of remuneration of different classes of workers, though they believe that the growth of education and the spirit of social service which would accompany it would bring remuneration to an approximate level.

SUMMARY OF THE SOCIALIST ARGUMENT

These different arguments may be summarised by the statement that under Capitalism we have on the one hand a great majority of workers living in sordid surroundings on inadequate food, employed on soul-deadening repetition work, seldom possessed of more than the bare means of subsistence, with no control over the means of production and seldom any chance of bettering their condition, and with the spectre of unemployment always before them: and on the other, a small minority of wealthy people who use their money for their own selfish pleasures.

This deplorable state of things arises, it is said, from the fact that land and Capital are in the hands of landlords and Capitalists who extort from the workers the surplus wealth which the latter produce, that as long as these conditions obtain the lot of the worker cannot improve: and that consequently the only remedy is for the State itself to be Landlord and Capitalist.

AN EVIL HERITAGE

This is indeed a terrible indictment against the existing order of things, and unfortunately it is very largely true. Our ills are an evil heritage of the industrial era under which a beautiful land was "uglified" by the transformation of green fields into slag heaps, the pollution of limpid rivers, the conversion of picturesque villages into hideous towns which cluster round still more hideous factories, in the slums of which herd a huge population, with the result that,

according to the statistics compiled by the Ministry of Pensions, out of $2\frac{1}{2}$ millions of men of military age only 36 per cent were found during the war to be of normal health and strength. Truly the many and great benefits which industrialism has conferred on us have been bought at a price !

LIMITATIONS TO SOCIALISM AS A REMEDY FOR ECONOMIC EVILS

But while recognising to the full the evils to which Socialists direct our attention, it is necessary first to examine the extent to which they are due to causes which would still operate whether Society was organised on a Socialistic or a Capitalistic basis.

Mass-production, for instance, which seems to be essential to a cheap and abundant supply of commodities with which to obtain food and raw material from abroad, entails the concentration of workers in factories and their employment to a large extent on uninteresting repetition work. Matters could, it is true, be improved in this respect by locating the factories in the country and thus creating variety of employment ; but this is just as practicable under the one system as under the other.

Nor again would Socialism necessarily banish unemployment which arises often from causes beyond the control of the State. The war between the Federals and the Confederates in America, which caused such terrible distress in Lancashire, or the caprices of fashion which sometimes throws whole industries out of gear, may be cited as instances. So again, the sudden adoption of prohibition would throw out of employment an enormous number of people not only in breweries and distilleries but in trades dependent on them.

Nor would Socialism alter the fundamental law that the vast majority of the population must be employed in manual (and to a large extent unskilled) labour, and

that their energies must be controlled and directed by a small minority. However Society is constituted there will always be a vast amount of hard and unpleasant work to be done, and if Society is to survive *someone must do it*. Who should do it? Obviously those least fitted for tasks demanding greater skill and intelligence. This is determined under the existing system in a rough and ready, and often unjust, manner: would it be settled with any greater justice on the basis of common ownership of land and Capital? There seems no reason for thinking so and many reasons for thinking otherwise.

Mr. Snowden's statement that the daily toil of the worker has in no way decreased in spite of labour-saving appliances is (or was before the war) accurate enough; but it is equally true of *all* workers, and has been since the time when Moses delivered the commandment "six days shalt thou labour," and is work after all such a dreadful thing! However this may be it is quite untrue to say that the condition of the manual labourer, or indeed of any other class, has not improved by the use of labour-saving appliances; one need only point to the substitution of electric light for tallow candles in disproof of the assertion.

EQUALITY

The theory that underlies all Socialistic thought is that inequalities of wealth and circumstance are inherently unjust, and that the nearer equality can be approached the happier the world will be. It would be theoretically possible to arrange that everyone should be well clothed, fed, and lodged, and that no one should be better off than his neighbour: but such a community would be intolerably dull, and might even perish from starvation induced by the lack of incentive to labour which competition supplies. For the beauty of nature and the joy of life consist not in uniformity

but in diversity. "Liberty, equality, and fraternity" sounds very well till we begin to consider what equality would really mean. When, for instance, we read that beautiful passage in Isaiah which describes how "every valley shall be filled, and every mountain and hill shall be laid low and the crooked shall be made straight and the rough places plain," few of us, caught by the glamour of the words, stop to visualise the appalling landscape they depict.

But the reader will have noticed that among the earlier writers there are two distinct schools of thought as to the just reward of labour. The followers of Proudhon plead for absolute equality, while the St. Simonites would take into consideration the value of the work performed. If the first system is adopted the capable and industrious worker will be exploited by the incompetent and lazy one: if the second method is followed the just assessment of the value of different kinds of work presents difficulties which have not yet been solved, and which seem to most to be unsurmountable.

LUCK

Socialists, like other philosophers, are apt to ignore or undervalue the part played in human affairs by the element of Luck. Luck may indeed be described as the salt which savours enterprise: it enters into every transaction, from starting a fried-fish shop to building an Atlantic liner: into every game (with the possible exception of chess): into every social incident—birth, marriage, and death. All curse their luck—when it goes against them—but *all* go out of their way to meet it. In so far as Socialism would banish Luck it would deprive the banquet of life of its salt.

THE NON-PRODUCERS

Another characteristic of Socialistic thought is to divide the community into two sections only—the employer of labour and the manual worker—ignoring

that very large and indispensable element which produces no material wealth at all, and which under a Socialistic regime would tend to disappear as being economically unnecessary. The process indeed may be said to have already begun, and this element has commenced to organize itself for self-protection under the name of the Middle Classes Union. Its tenets rather belie its name, which suggests social distinctions, whereas its policy is to secure a "fair deal" to all classes of the community and to oppose unfair discrimination against the middle interest, which being politically unorganized is the greatest sufferer from class legislation, with the exception perhaps of "free" labour.

Even the most extreme Socialists would admit that the production of material wealth is not, or should not be, the sole end and aim of a highly civilized society. Without our writers, artists, actors, musicians, scientists, doctors, dentists, schoolmasters, clergy, explorers, astronomers, and other non-producers it would be a dull England, and without our soldiers, sailors, and airmen a very unsafe one. But these and many other occupations demand leisure and a measure of wealth which in the Socialistic state would be grudged to them by the wealth-producers. Moreover, it is these non-producers who approach most nearly to ideal citizenship—the subordination of the desire for wealth to the performance of service.

THE MARXIAN DOCTRINE

The Marxian doctrine that all wealth is produced by the manual workers and should therefore be enjoyed by them alone, though abandoned by many Socialists, is still advanced on many platforms. In a sense it is of course perfectly true, since no raw material can be converted into a manufactured article or moved from one place to another except through the agency of

men's hands, assisted though they may be by machinery or animal power. The hands, however, are powerless without the directing brain behind them ; and even if we eliminate the word " manual " and enlarge the word " worker " to include brain workers, the statement is still only partially true, since new wealth cannot be produced without the agency of wealth already produced and stored up in the form of capital. It may require, for instance, the expenditure of hundreds of thousands of pounds of capital to develop a colliery before it becomes remunerative : the capital may even be entirely lost. If it were transferred to the State, would its new custodians feel justified in embarking on such an uncertain venture ? Probably not. This is not to say that the State should never undertake enterprises which are unlikely to be remunerative in the near future, such as railways, canals, or irrigation projects, the development of sparsely inhabited or ill-cultivated areas, big schemes of afforestation and the like, which would be beyond the scope of private enterprise. It is quite true, as Mr. Snowden points out, that all kinds of services are often more or less successfully managed by the State or by municipal bodies, but it is extremely improbable that they would ever have *invented* such things as the steam-engine or the dynamo, without which railways, tramways, and electric lighting could have no existence. Corporate bodies *may* administer successfully, individuals alone initiate and invent.

THE ALLEGED RELUCTANCE OF THE WORKER TO WORK FOR THE INDIVIDUAL

It is constantly asserted that the discontent of the manual worker with the existing order proceeds largely from the fact that an undue proportion of the profits arising from his labour goes to enrich individuals, and that he would work more willingly if they accrued to the State (i.e. the community).

The theory, however, does not square with the facts, as witness the recent tramway strikes in Manchester, Salford, and Oldham. Here we have undertakings owned and worked by the community: an industrial council adjusts the dispute, and the workmen repudiate the agreement made by their representatives and go on strike for higher wages *against the community*. Or take again the strikes by the employés of co-operative societies, or of those of the London Water Board, who were prepared to deprive a population of seven millions of the first necessity of life, if their employers—*again the community*—refused their demands. The fact is that while it is possible to entertain feelings of respect or even affection towards an individual employer, an abstraction such as the State or the Municipality is incapable of inspiring enthusiasm: it rather presents itself as an object for exploitation. A person who would shrink in horror from robbery of an individual has often small scruple in defrauding the State when presented in the form of a custom-house or income-tax official.

Mr. Snowden would have us believe that the higher social instinct which he expects to be fostered by a better system of education will induce us all to put forth our best energies from a sense of duty to our fellow-citizens rather than from the prospect of material advantage to ourselves: this is happily even now the case with a considerable number (*vide* previous para on non-producers), but there seems little prospect of such an altruistic attitude becoming general, and until this is the case a State conducted on Socialistic lines seems impossible of attainment.

NATIONALIZATION

The only worthy object of Socialism is to improve the status and material conditions of the workers, and this Socialists seek to accomplish by the nationalization

of services and industries. Many fair-minded Socialists are constrained to admit that State management has been proved by the late war to be less efficient than private enterprise; they nevertheless still contend that the prospect under Socialism of better conditions for the manual workers outweighs this disadvantage. It is very unlikely that this would be the case. Where State-owned and managed railways are working side by side with those managed by private enterprise, as in India, the workers in the former case are no better, and often worse, off than in the latter. Moreover any loss in efficiency in the conduct of industrial concerns, which almost invariably results from State management, much diminishes the wealth of the whole community, and puts it at a grave disadvantage in competing for trade with other nations. Thus, though the worker might gain an initial advantage from a more equitable division of profits arising from his labour, he would eventually be a sufferer from the fact that there would be less wealth to distribute.

The allegation that unrestricted competition fosters man's worst instincts and makes him hard, cruel, and selfish is unfortunately too often true, but the desire for wealth proceeds just as often from an altruistic motive—the benefit of the children.

TRUSTS AND COMBINES

The Socialist is on firmer ground in asserting that Socialism is the inevitable outcome of the growing tendency of individual concerns in different trades to coalesce into Trusts and Combines of the whole industry, though it is hardly logical to inveigh at the same time against free competition of which the Trusts are the negation. They undoubtedly constitute a source of possible danger to the consumer since they are enabled, if they so choose, to dictate the price in a manner that would be impossible under the free

competition of the different firms which produce and distribute the commodity. The evidence taken under the Profiteering Act shows that in some cases (and particularly where the production, transport, and distribution of an article, such as petrol, is controlled by agencies outside the jurisdiction of the State) this has actually taken place. In this connection the dictum of Sir Marcus Samuel, director of the Shell Company, may be recalled, "It is no use mincing matters. The price of an article is exactly what it will fetch."

The problem how to retain some of the advantages of the Combine or Trust, and at the same time to protect the interests of the users, is doubtless a difficult one ; but short of Socialization the solution may perhaps be found in the appointment of a State director to sit on the boards of all monopolist concerns who would guard the interests of the consumers in the same way as the Director of Indian guaranteed railway companies watches the interests of the Government of India, which is the lessor.

DICTATORSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT

A phrase which is frequently on the lips of the more extreme Socialists is "the dictatorship of the Proletariat," which they regard as the true millennium. It is difficult to understand the mentality of people who are all for "freedom" and "democracy," and who yet contemplate with equanimity a dictatorship of *any* kind ; for a dictatorship is the negation of the democratic principle and no more likely to be wisely exercised by a particular section of the community than by an absolute sovereign.

FURTHER CAUSES THAT MAKE FOR SOCIALISM

In addition to the many causes already mentioned which have fostered the growth of Socialism in this

country, additional impetus has been given of late years by the following :—

1. The enormous rise in prices, and the exasperation (which is by no means confined to the wage-earner) engendered by the suspicion that employers have taken advantage of war conditions to enrich themselves at the expense of the community: the fact that the workers themselves are often in the same condemnation brings them no consolation! This suspicion lends force to the argument that such abuses would not be possible in the Socialist Utopia. It may be noticed here that the saddle is not always put on the right horse: the profiteering manufacturer and merchant do at least supply us with goods—at a price: but what benefit enures to the community from the operations of financiers who amass enormous fortunes by manipulating other people's money and juggling with the continental exchanges? How, for instance, did the late Lord Michelham contrive to make a fortune of seven millions, and to what extent has the country gained by his activities, or by those of Baron Bruno von Schroeder, who was naturalized at the outbreak of the war in order—or so it was said—to save our financial system from collapse? Mr. Sydney Webb might usefully devote his talent for investigation to the preparation of statistics which would show the number and magnitude of fortunes made by the former class of citizens as compared with the latter.

2. The allegation, which is the more dangerous because it is so largely true, that the Government of this country is largely run by, and in the interest of, the Capitalist. This puts a weapon into the hands of the extremists who preach that Constitutional Government is a farce and a failure and that the proletariat will never secure their rights until it is abolished.

3. The great influx of aliens (mostly Jews) from Russia and Central Europe. These are usually of the revolutionary type: they forced themselves on the

attention of the Englishman during the London air-raids, when those of them who could afford it fled to Brighton, or other safe resorts in the country, and those who could not crowded into the tubes. They have been conspicuous at meetings at the Albert Hall (now the favourite rendezvous for the disaffected) and at Leeds, which claims the highest percentage of Jews of any city in the United Kingdom, where a revolution on the Russian model was advocated.

4. The discontent among the demobilized soldiers and sailors who have for a pittance suffered appalling hardships and dangers, and find on their return to the Land which was to be fit for heroes, a scarcity of houses, opportunity for honest work denied, and comrades who stayed at home living in comparative affluence. Small wonder that many of them turn with hungry eyes to the roseate pictures limned by the Socialist artists.

5. The activities of the Labour colleges who turn out annually an increasing number of teachers nursed on the Marxian dogmas, and the absence of any adequate measures to present to their hearers the other side of the argument. It is even asserted that there is a growing tendency among teachers in the employ of the State to present to their pupils the arguments for Socialism in a favourable light and to ignore those against it.

ALTERNATIVES TO SOCIALISM

Since no one can ignore the defects of the Capitalistic system: its defenders should be prepared to indicate some means (short of Socialism) by which these defects may be minimized.

The idea seems to be gaining ground that there is something actually discreditable in the possession of wealth. The trouble is, of course, not that there are too many rich people but too many poor ones. It is a fact that far too large a proportion of the population do not possess, and see no prospect of acquiring, private

property, and that too many property-owners forget that the ownership of property entails duties as well as rights. It is noticeable in this connection that Socialism has a greater vogue in towns than in the country, where the old tradition still lingers that the ownership of land is not absolute, but contingent on the performance of certain services, and where the personal relations between employer and employed are more intimate.

CO-PARTNERSHIP

The worker of the present day has lost his independence and the control over the means of production, which he enjoyed when implements were simple and cheap, in consequence of the introduction of the factory system, and with it also a direct pecuniary interest in the commodities which he produces. For good or evil machinery and factories have come to stay, and with their advent has largely disappeared the personal relation between employer and employed, or, as old-fashioned people still speak of it, between "master and man." Improvement in the status and condition of the wage-earner must therefore be sought along other lines. These seem to lie in the direction of co-partnership, profit-sharing, or the bonus system (wherever the circumstances of the industry permit of its application), which would at once give to the worker some voice in the conduct of the industry and raise his status to that of a part-owner. An example of a successful profit-sharing scheme is that of a farm in Surrey, where the farmer takes 6 per cent on the capital, pays the men a living weekly wage, and the remaining profits are then shared amongst them. Curiously enough, objections to schemes of this nature arise less from the employer, who might be expected to resent the surrender of any portion of his authority and profits, than from Trade-Union leaders, who should, one would imagine, be the first to welcome

them. The suspicion is naturally engendered in the mind of the impartial observer that these champions of the worker are actuated less by a real concern for his interests than by a fear lest the Socialistic theory should be imperilled, and the agitator be deprived of a comfortable living. Had the millions annually squandered in unnecessary strikes been applied by Trade-Unions to the purchase of shares in industrial concerns they would by now be able to "control the means of production."

UNEMPLOYMENT

It would perhaps be safe to say that the dread of unemployment (which by the way is by no means confined to the manual worker) is one of the most potent weapons in the armoury of the Socialist.

When an industry or service fails to provide a reasonable profit on Capital invested and an adequate wage to the worker unemployment must result unless the industry is artificially assisted at the expense of the community, either by subsidies, or, where its decay is due to foreign competition, by tariffs: and this will be the case whether the industry is owned and worked by the State or by private enterprise. It will depend on the importance of the industry to the general well-being whether it should be allowed to perish or whether one or other of these remedies should be applied. The Cornish miners are a case in point.

But unemployment of a temporary or seasonal character occurs also in the most prosperous industries, and can be met by creating during prosperous years in every industry a reserve fund to stabilise wages when trade is slack and short time has to be worked, in the same manner as companies pass a proportion of their net earnings to reserve to stabilise dividends. The workers would contribute a small proportion of their earnings to build up such a reserve, the unexpended portion being paid to them in a lump sum on leaving their employment.

As has been already suggested, variety of occupation could be supplied if factories were moved into the country and the workers supplied with gardens or allotments, due care being taken to preserve natural beauties. A gardener is seldom a revolutionary.

Repetition work is a necessary feature of mass-production, but there seems no reason, except a small loss in efficiency, why a man should be employed from year's end to year's end on the *same* job. Over-sectionizing of labour tends to eliminate the all-round skilled artisan.

The status of manual labour would be raised and class prejudice eliminated if a greater number of Public Schools and University men would devote themselves to mechanical engineering and similar industries and "go through the mill" with the other workers, for nothing more stimulates camaraderie than working, playing, or fighting together for a common object.

OVER-POPULATION

Many hold that these islands are over-populated and that in another generation or so it will be impossible for its inhabitants to secure the food and raw material they require, owing to a steadily decreasing supply from America and other countries whose growing population tends to absorb the surplus which was formerly available.

EMIGRATION

This seems not unlikely to happen, and strengthens the plea for emigration as one remedy for unemployment. England is in the fortunate position of mother to a number of daughter States which can absorb with advantage millions of her offspring, and properly viewed the transference is not "emigration" but rather the transplantation of a plant or flower from one corner of a garden to another with the consent and co-operation of the different gardeners.

The transplantation must of course be voluntary in the case of the Englishman, but compulsion may be advantageously applied to all aliens who evaded the obligation to render military service either to England or her Allies. When hospitality is abused by the stranger within our gates to the detriment of the children of the house it ceases to be a virtue and deportation is as just as it is necessary. Complaint is justly made by Socialists of the slums which deface our great cities, but the "slumminess" is generally due to the preponderance of that very alien element for which they express so much solicitude, and now that England has assumed a mandate for Palestine a unique opportunity offers to repatriate all those of Oriental origin whose presence here is not essential to the well-being of the community.

IMMIGRATION

It is clearly futile, however, to draw off good wine from the cask by opening the tap if an equal amount of dirty water is admitted through the bung-hole, and we might follow with advantage the example of our dominions and the U.S.A., who are as careful to exclude undesirables as we are negligent.

POLITICAL CORRUPTION *

Few will dispute the truth, or minimize the gravity, of the charge which Socialists bring against the capitalistic character of our Government. Parliament has so sunk in popular estimation that the word "politician" now conveys the sense of opprobrium rather than of respect.

Many attribute this decadence to the action of the House of Commons in granting salaries to its members (and this without first seeking sanction from the electorate which provides them) and thus destroying the age-long tradition of gratuitous service to the

* See page 47.

State. However this may be, few will deny that politics are unduly influenced by our great financiers—who speak so often with a foreign accent. Does this explain, one may ask in passing, the solicitude for the alien which has been so conspicuous, before, during, and after the war?

Debates in both Houses of Parliament have established the fact that Honours and Dignities are frequently bestowed for monetary considerations, on persons who have no claim to them except their wealth—that in effect a system of bribery and corruption (for it can be called by no other name) obtains in our politics which results in an aristocracy of wealth in place of one of character and service, and destroys public confidence in the purity of motive which should inform the administration.

The remedy for this evil proposed by the National Party, viz., the transference of recommendations for Honours from the Prime Minister to a select committee of Privy Council or of the House of Lords has been rejected by the Government for reasons which are far from convincing. It may seem strange that views which are so largely held in the country should find so small representation in the House of Commons, but when it is realized that the big financial interests would suffer by such political reforms as those advocated there is little reason for surprise though much for regret.

The increasing dependence of political machinery on money is the central vice of the political system: it is responsible for such deplorable incidents as the election of Trebitsch Lincoln, a German spy, who was recommended to the electorate which he misrepresented by no less a person among others than our present Prime Minister.—Clearly, then, the aim should be to rescue the electorate, as far as may be, from the grip of the Party machine, and to encourage the election of local candidates. If the common law, which still survives,

were enforced, and if the salaries of Members of Parliament were paid by the constituency which actually appoints them, instead of by the State, which neither appoints nor concerns itself with their qualifications, the ratepayers would be more careful in their choice of a candidate, the House of Commons would more closely represent the electorate, and (no light consideration) the taxpayers would be to some extent relieved, since those Members only to whom the salary is a serious consideration would press for it.

It is unfortunately the case that Members of Parliament too often regard themselves as delegates of a Party rather than as trustees of the public interest, which is their true function. The judgment of Lords Moulton and Farwell in the celebrated Osborn case suggests that it is *illegal* for any outside body, such as a political party, to pay the expenses of a Member or maintain him in Parliament on the understanding that he shall vote in a certain manner. If this dictum were embodied in an Act of Parliament the Party organizations would be restricted to their legitimate functions.

Until Constitutional Government, either by these or other means, is purged of the money taint, it will continue to invite the attacks of those who seek its destruction as being run in the interests of wealth.

SPORT

It is noticeable that of all the many grievances of the worker Socialists seldom enlarge on one very real one—the want of adequate facilities for games. Of the thousands who look on at a football match, and the hundreds at a game of cricket, how many must be pining to be playing themselves, and how few get the chance!

This indifference on the part of the Socialist to one of the best and strongest of an Englishman's instincts, argues that he is out of touch with the national character (which is not perhaps surprising seeing that

English Socialism is so largely of alien origin) and is in striking contrast to the attitude of the King and the Royal Family who understand it so well. If games, and particularly concerted games, were regarded, as they should be, as an essential part of popular education, just as they are in our so-called "Public" schools, the spirit of fair play, self-sacrifice, co-operation, discipline, and leadership which they engender would do more to make good citizens than much of the learning which the schools impart. Equally beneficial would be the adoption of cadet military training, as practised in Australia and Switzerland. It is probable that if Lord Roberts' counsel had been followed there would have been no Armageddon.

POPULAR EDUCATION

It is doubtful whether our system of popular education is in other respects best fitted to meet national needs. If it is judged by the mental pabulum displayed on railway bookstalls it stands indeed condemned. The natural inclination of nearly every boy is to make things and do things rather than to assimilate knowledge: and seeing, as Mr. H. A. Jones points out in *Patriotism and Popular Education*, that some 85 per cent of the population must gain a living by their hands, however much their leisure hours may be brightened by literature and art, the aim should surely be to foster this inclination. The nation needs a large supply of skilful artisans and a small number of "literati," yet the tendency of popular education is to supply an undue proportion of the latter. The unfortunate results of such a policy are well seen in India where we deliberately foster sedition by turning out "literate" enormously in excess of the demand which is exceedingly limited. If the rudiments of political economy were taught in our schools there might be some hope the next generation would not be

misled by the fallacies which are accepted to-day by the workers as economic truth.

EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY

“Equality of opportunity” is a principle now generally accepted by many not professing Socialism, who do not perceive where it leads them. There can be no equality of opportunity in education so long as the well-to-do parent can secure for his child a better education than the poor one. Equality of opportunity therefore demands the abolition of the so-called “Public” schools, and the free education of every child on the same lines. This would destroy one of the greatest incentives to thrift and self-sacrifice, for the ambition of every good parent is to give his child the best education that he can afford.

Admitting the necessity of compulsory education, the wisdom of giving it gratis is questionable: nothing is appreciated at its proper value which is to be had for nothing, and further there is the obvious objection that parents who can well afford to pay are now often tempted, and will be more so in the future, to get their children educated at the expense of ratepayers, many of whom are poorer than they are themselves.

FREEDOM

Every step towards the Socialistic state involves some surrender of individual freedom which is the breath of life to all true Englishmen. The freedom of the individual must necessarily be more restricted as the structure of Society grows more complex, but every surrender must be watched with suspicion for it will entirely disappear when the Socialist goal is reached: the “servile state” envisaged by Belloc and Chesterton will then be born.

RELIGION

The fundamental fallacy of Socialism is that it prescribes an economic remedy for an ethical disease. For it is not, as Mr. Snowden believes, the Capitalistic system which makes men "hard, cruel, selfish, and acquisitive": these defects in human nature are the cause, and not the consequence, of the admitted evils which disfigure it, and which Socialists are by no means alone in deploring.

The communist system of the early Christians, which is often quoted by Socialists as an argument for Socialism, succeeded—for a time—first because it grew from within, and was not imposed from without, and secondly because the little community which practised it was inspired to an extraordinary degree by that spirit of self-sacrifice, and brotherly love, which their Master and ours spent His life in teaching, and of which His death was the supreme manifestation. It failed because its followers lost the vision. What prospect of success, then, is there for a system on very similar lines but on an immensely greater scale whose advocates ignore—where they do not deny—religion? When greed and self-indulgence on the one hand, and envy and jealousy on the other, are banished from our midst, then, and not till then, will Socialism be a possible system—but then it will not be needed.

POLITICAL CORRUPTION

AND
HOW TO END IT

By
SUPH

A pamphlet showing how the Standard of Political Morality has been lowered and political freedom lost to the Electorate, investigating the reasons for this deterioration and suggesting remedies.

Price 6d. post free.

Copies can be obtained from—

The Society for Upholding Political
Honour

25 FITZ-JAMES AVENUE, W. 14.



PUBLISHED BY
GRANT RICHARDS LIMITED

THE CAUSE OF WORLD UNREST

Crown 8vo. 10s. 6d. net.

"The case is now before the jury of the nation, and those who do not wish to accept the lessons of the innumerable facts submitted in 'The Cause of World Unrest' must be prepared with an alternative explanation. They cannot rebut the stern logic of actuality by throwing 'Anti-Semite' or other rhetorical brick-bats at the heads of its authors or by emphasising small controversial points."

CLEMENCEAU

THE MAN AND HIS TIME. By H. M. HYNDMAN.

Demy 8vo. 12s. 6d. net.

"A comprehensive survey of the great man's life work, and an illuminating picture of his personality."—*Clarion*.

**THE RAGGED TROUSERED
PHILANTHROPISTS**

By ROBERT TRESSALL. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. net.*

"This striking novel on the terrible conditions among sections of the unorganised building trades . . . the life of the hopeless wage-slaves of unrestricted capitalism."—*Justice*.

THE TAINT IN POLITICS

Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d. net.

"Deserves attention as a searching and forcible exposure of many undoubted abuses. Lack of principle, lightly disguised corruption, privileged incompetence, a pampered and leisured Civil Service . . . are often convincingly attacked."—*Times*.

THE BOLSHEVIK THEORY

By R. W. POSTGATE. *Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d. net.*

" . . . Mr. Postgate's exposition of Bolshevist principles is so frank and clear that it should be read by every working man."—*Morning Post*.

"This is a book which I strongly recommend."—*Daily Herald*.

THE EVOLUTION OF REVOLUTION

By H. M. HYNDMAN. *Demy 8vo. 21s. net. In Preparation.*

ST. MARTIN STREET, LONDON, W.C. 2.



UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY

Los Angeles

This book is DUE on the last date stamped below.

N 1 5 1950

N 1 3 1967

REC'D LD-URL

LD
URL

APR 21 1972

REC'D URL

79 72

JUL 14 1972

rm L9-25m-9, '47 (A5618) 444

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
AT
LOS ANGELES



AA 000 429 550 7

